

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 and 30-36 are pending in this case. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowance of Claims 1-22.

Claims 30-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stearns, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,705). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 30 includes the feature wherein "one or more of said plurality of signal lines is between a pair of said plurality of first power lines, and further wherein said signal lines between said pair of said plurality of first power lines and said pair of said plurality of first power lines are between a pair of said second power lines." Stearns does not disclose such a feature. Taking the configuration described in the Office Action with respect to Stearns's Figure 6, for example, signal lines lying between power lines 50 and 56 do not also lie between lines forming Stearns's "enclosed configuration" 58. Enclosed configuration 58 lies on the opposite side of the substrate layout from the signal lines that lie between power lines 50 and 56. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claim 30 is patentable over Stearns. Claims 31-33 depend on Claim 30 and are therefore patentable over Stearns for at least the reasons presented above.

Claim 34 includes the feature "wherein said lines are arranged such that one or more lines in a first set of lines of a first width are between lines of said second width, and such that one or more lines in a second set of lines of said second width are between lines of said third width." Stearns does not disclose such a feature. The Examiner relies on segments of signal connection features 22 to arrive at the claimed lines of three different widths. Applicant respectfully submits that portions of circular contacts 22 are not lines. A more appropriate comparison would be the straight portions of Stearns's lines, all of the relevant ones of which are the same width. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claim 34 is

patentable over Stearns. Claim 36 depends from Claim 34 and is therefore patentable over Stearns for at least the reasons presented above.

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stearns in view of Sheldon, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,587). Claim 35 depends from Claim 34 and is therefore distinguished from Stearns for at least the reasons presented above. Sheldon does not cure the deficiencies of Stearns. Since the combined references fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of the invention, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 35 is patentable over Stearns in view of Sheldon. In addition, there is no suggestion in the references for a combination of the teachings of Sheldon with those of Stearns. Stearns's teachings are related to a package and method, whereas Sheldon's teachings are directed to electrical motor safety. The skilled artisan would receive no motivation from either reference for the proposed combination.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this amendment, the withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections, and allowance of Claims 1-22 and 30-36. If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed telephone number and address.

Respectfully submitted,



Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: 972 917-5653
Fax: 972 917-4418

Michael K. Skrehot
Reg. No. 36,682